

signal specifically disclosed by Doornhein et al. is that the additional data signal denotes the aspect ratio of the television signal.

The subject invention, as claimed in claim 1, includes "receiving an analog television signal along with a quality indication relating to the analog picture signal" and "processing the analog picture signal in dependence on the quality indication".

The Examiner has stated "The aspect ratio information meets the quality indication signal as claimed because a television image quality can be determined based on its aspect ratio. Conventionally, aspect ratio of 4:3 indicates standard signal while 16:9 indicates HDTV.", and now states "In column 4, lines 25-28, Doornhein disclose a format conversion for converting a television image with aspect ratio 4:3 to aspect ratio 16:9 in accordance with the aspect ratio control information. The conversion obviously changes the resolution of the original image because some pixels are either added or deleted in the final image signal. Since the conversion is depended on the aspect ratio information, a quality indication signal, Doornhein clearly meets the claimed invention."

It appears that the Examiner is using the argument that since the Doornhein et al. receiver processes the received video signal in dependence on the received additional data signal indicating the aspect ratio of the received video signal, and as such the processed video signal has a different quality than the

received video signal (due to the addition/deletion of pixels), that the additional data signal indicating the aspect ratio is "a quality indication relating to the analog picture signal".

Applicants submit that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, any processing of a received video signal affects the quality of the received video signal. In the case of the additional data signal indicating the aspect ratio as described in Doornhein et al., Applicants submit that any processing is dependent on the aspect ratio of the display being used to display the received video signal. However, this additional data signal indicating the aspect ratio of the received video signal is not a quality indication relating to the analog picture signal as specifically claimed in claim 1. It should be noted that "aspect ratio" is an attribute of the video signal, but does not indicate the "quality".

In the subject invention, as claimed, the quality indication relating to the analog picture signal is received with the analog picture signal. The term "quality indication" is described in the Substitute Specification on page 3, lines 1-11 (paragraph [0008]):

"Preferably, the first quality indication Q11 is the bit-rate and/or compression ratio and/or the quantization level at which the digital picture signal (used to form the analog picture signal) has been encoded and or other information about the encoding or decoding, such as information about the level of compression via inverse quantization process and/or quantizer matrix (for intra and non-intra pictures) when the default ones are not used and/or intra-dc-

precision and/or information when a decoding error happened."

Each of these parameters has a direct bearing on the quality of the analog picture signal.


The Examiner further adds "it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., better picture quality) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)."

Applicants have reviewed their last response and the term "better picture quality" only appears in the 3rd from the last paragraph in Applicants' Remarks! Further, this is in relation to the advantages indicated in the Substitute Specification attainable by tying the processing of the received video signal to the quality indication signal. Applicants submit that it should be understood that Applicants are not relying on this term as an unwritten claim limitation.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-13, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by 
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611